

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application, all of which have been amended through this Amendment. Each of the pending claims is believed to define an invention that is allowable over the cited references. Based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is earnestly requested.

1. On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Specifically, claims 5 and 12 are rejected for lack of antecedent basis for the recitation of “the originals of the first document and the second document.” Claims 4 and 11, on which claims 5 and 12 respectively depend, have been amended to establish proper antecedent basis for all features of claims 5 and 12. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 12 and allowable thereof is respectfully requested.

2. On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, claim 15 is rejected for being directed at a “document relationship inspection program,” which the Office Action asserts as being non-statutory subject matter. Claim 15 has been amended to recite “An apparatus including a central processing unit to execute a document relationship inspection program.” The amendment to claim 15 is supported by the written description, for example, on page 53, lines 5-7 and page 11, lines 20-25.

The claimed apparatus is a statutory article of manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

3. On pages 3-9 of the Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,140,522 to Ito *et al.* (“Ito”). These rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to claims 1-14, as amended.

The present invention inspects the relationship between constituent elements of a first document and constituent elements of a second document. By way of illustration, the present invention includes a document parsing section 2 which parses the structure of a document and applies the parsing results of the document to a document structure comparison section 3. See, e.g., FIG. 1 and page 13, lines 12-14. The structure may refer to a natural-linguistic and logical hierarchical structure of a writing, which indicates a structure related to positions and inclusive relations of chapters, clauses, paragraphs, sentences, etc. See, e.g., page 13, lines 14-18. Thus, the document structure parsing section 2 parses the hierarchical structure of a document for more efficient processing of document comparison. See, e.g., page 13, lines 24-25. The document structure comparison section 3 then compares the depths in the hierarchical structures of an original document and the revised document and inspects the differences and coincidences of sentences of each sentence block to determine whether the blocks correspond to one another. See, e.g., page 18, line 11 – page 19, line 8.

Turning to the claims, claim 1 recites a document relationship inspection apparatus which inspects a relationship between constituent elements of a first document and constituent elements of a second document. The document relationship inspection apparatus includes a logical hierarchical

structure parsing section which parses a logical hierarchical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively, in the constituent elements of the first document and which parses a logical hierarchical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively, in the constituent elements of the second document. The document relationship inspection apparatus also includes a relationship detection section which detects the relationship between the sentence blocks of the first document and the sentence blocks of the second document on the basis of a parsing result from the logical hierarchical structure parsing section.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ito. Ito is directed to a translation method and apparatus that utilize a translation of a stored original document to help translate a new original document. See Ito, Abstract. As depicted in FIG. 2a of Ito, the translation of the new original document is performed by determining whether there is any sentence in an old original document that is similar to an i-th sentence of the new original document. See, Ito, Col. 4, lines 40-44. If no sentence in the old original document is similar to the i-th sentence in the new original document, then that sentence is sent to the translation unit. See, Ito, Col. 4, lines 45-49. However, if a sentence in the old original document is found to be similar to the i-th sentence of the new original document, then the existing translation of that sentence are read out and displayed. See, Ito, Col. 4, lines 45-58.

Ito fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least two reasons. First, Ito fails to teach or suggest “a logical hierarchical structure parsing section which **parses a logical hierarchical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively**, in the constituent elements of the first document and which **parses a logical hierarchical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively**, in the constituent elements of the

second document,” as recited in the amended claim 1 (emphasis added). As described above, Ito does not parse a **logical hierarchical structure** of the old original document or the new original document to a **plurality of sentence blocks**. Instead, Ito teaches traversing the old original document to find a sentence that is similar to an i-th sentence in the new original document. See, Ito, Col. 4, lines 40-44. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in Ito of parsing “a logical hierarchical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively,” as recited in the amended claim 1.

Second, Ito fails to teach or suggest “a relationship detection section which detects the **relationship between the sentence blocks** of the first document and the sentence blocks of the second document **on the basis of a parsing result** from the logical structure parsing section,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). In Ito, the similarity of sentences between the old original document and the new original document is determined based on a number of criteria such as whether the main verb and the last word of the j-th sentence in the old original document match that of the i-th sentence new original document. See, Ito, FIG. 3 and Col. 5, lines 41-55. Thus, in Ito, a relationship (e.g., similarity) is determined between **sentences** based on the **words within the sentence**. In the present claim, on the other hand, the relation is detected between **sentence blocks** on the basis of the **parsing result**. Thus, the teachings of Ito are not applicable to, and thus do not anticipate, claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted as allowable over Ito. Claims 2-7 are dependent on claim 1 and are submitted as allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 8 is directed to a document relationship inspection method which inspects a relationship between constituent elements of a first document and constituent elements of a second

document. The document relationship inspection method of claim 8 recites similar features as claim 1. Specifically, claim 8 recites “**parsing a logical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively**, in the constituent elements of the first document and **parsing a logical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively**, in the constituent elements of the second document” (emphasis added). Claim 8 also recites “detecting the **relationship between the sentence blocks** of the first document and the sentence blocks of the second document **on the basis of a parsing result** from the logical structure parsing section” (emphasis added). As previously discussed with reference to claim 1, these features are not taught or suggested by Ito. Thus, claim 8 is submitted as allowable.

Claims 9-14 are dependent on claim 8 and are submitted as allowable for at least the same reasons.

4. On pages 9-10 of the Office Action, claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,140,522 to Ito *et al.* (“Ito”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 is directed to an apparatus including a central processing unit to execute a document relationship inspection program which inspects the relationship between constituent elements of a first document and constituent elements of a second document. In rejecting claim 15, the Office Action states that Ito teaches all features of claim 15, except that it does not disclose a program which inspects the relationship between constituent elements of a first and constituent elements of a second document. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Ito fails to teach or render obvious several features of claim 15.


Claim 15 recites similar features as claim 1. Specifically, claim 15 recites “a logical hierarchical structure parsing function which **parses a logical hierarchical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively**, in the constituent elements of the first document and which **parses a logical hierarchical structure of a plurality of sentence blocks, including at least one sentence respectively**, in the constituent elements of the second document” (emphasis added). Claim 15 also recites “a relationship detection function which detects **the relationship between the sentence blocks** of the first document and the sentence blocks of the second document **on the basis of a parsing result** from the logical structure parsing section” (emphasis added). As previously discussed with reference to claim 1, these features are not taught by Ito. Further, there is no suggestion in Ito that would render these features obvious. Thus, claim 15 is submitted as allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 6, 2008

By 
For Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D. Justine Gozzi
Registration No.: 41,289 60,513
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

MAS:JAG/elw
::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS\1\950846\2